

Amendments to the Drawings

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Figure 1. This sheet replaces the original sheet including Figure 1. In Figure 1, descriptive text labels have been added to the unlabeled elements. Shading has also been removed from the elements in the Figures and portions of the schematic diagram have been enlarged to fit the text labels. No new matter has been added.

Remarks/Argument

The Applicant has amended claims 1 through 4 to correct some minor errors as pointed out by the Examiner. The Applicant has amended Figure 1 to add text labels as requested by the Examiner. No new matter has been added.

The Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection of claims 1 to 4 of the present application. In particular, the Applicant submits that the step "if the time required to play all of the currently queued animations is greater than the minimum deadline of the server messages in the queue, accelerating the animation" are not disclosed in DeMoney in combination with Goldberg.

The step in claims 1 through 4 "if the time required to play all of the currently queued animations is greater than the minimum deadline of the server messages in the queue, accelerating the animation", as discussed above, is not disclosed in either Goldberg or DeMoney. DeMoney does not disclose accelerating the animation at all. Goldberg discloses acceleration, but under very different conditions than those set out in the claims of the present application.

Goldberg describes the use of acceleration to "catch up" to a live performance. The acceleration is not based on test "if the time required to play all of the currently queued animation is greater than the minimum deadline of the server messages in the queue" but is rather based on whether the animation has "caught up" to a live presentation. In this way the time left in to complete the performance is not at all relevant to Goldberg's acceleration and may not even be determinable given the vagaries of a live performance. Thus Goldberg does not include or even suggest that such a test for acceleration could be appropriate, and therefore should not be the basis of a 35 USC 103 objection.

Likewise, DeMoney uses its deadlines in a very different manner from the present application, as they are used for scheduling requests from different multimedia streams, not for ensuring a particular stream is timely completed. Therefore, DeMoney also does not teach or suggest using the test "if the time required to play all of the currently queued animations is

greater than the minimum deadline of the server messages in the queue" for handling a single multimedia stream.

Given the above remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Armand Benitah (Reg. No. 56026)
c/o Fasken Martineau DuMoulin LLP
Suite 2100, 1075 West Georgia Street
Vancouver, British Columbia V6E 3G2
Tel: 604-631-4743
Fax: 604-632-4743



Appn. No. 09/978,082
Amdt. Dated Mar. 14, 2006
Reply to Office Action of Sept. 14, 2005
Annotated Sheet Showing Changes

FIG. 1

